

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,697,130 to Weindorf et al. (hereafter "Weindorf") in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,697,042 to Cohen et al. (hereafter "Cohen").

Claims 4, 7-8, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,781,648 to Takahasi et al. (hereafter "Takahasi") in view of Weindorf and Cohen.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahasi in view of Weindorf and Cohen, further in view of European Patent Application No. EP 0580908 to Uratani (hereafter "Uratani").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, and 26. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 26 and 28 remain pending in this application for further reconsideration.

All claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weindorf in view of Cohen. Claims 4, 7-8, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahasi in view of Weindorf and Cohen. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahasi in view of Weindorf and Cohen, further in view of Uratani. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

With regard to independent claim 1, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Weindorf and Cohen, whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a claimed combination including at least a recited feature of “a substrate parallel to the light-guiding plate.”

The Office Action appears to allege that Weindorf teaches or suggests each and every feature of independent claim 1 except for a feature of “LED housing as well as each LED has a portion disposed inside the housing and a portion disposed outside the housing.” The Office Action relies upon Cohen to teach such a feature. In contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claim 1, Weindorf (See FIG. 3) discloses a PCB substrate perpendicular to light-guiding plate. In the Weindorf, there is a short distance between a light-incidence surface of the light-guiding plate and a light-emitting surface of LED arranged on the PCB substrate perpendicular to light-guiding plate. Accordingly, the different colored lights emitted from the respective LED lamps of Weindorf do not fully mix, so that it is not possible to create the uniform white light within portion of the light-guiding plate. But, in the present invention, there is a long distance between a light-incidence surface of the light-guiding plate and a light-emitting surface of LED arranged on the PCB substrate parallel to light-guiding plate. Accordingly, the different colored lights emitted from the respective LED lamps of the present invention mix, so that it is possible to create the uniform white light within the light-guiding plate. Cohen fails to teach or suggest the above-noted feature of claim 1.

With regard to independent claims 4 and 26, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Takahasi, Weindorf and Cohen, whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a claimed combination including at least a recited feature of “a substrate parallel to the light-guiding plate.”

The Office Action appears to allege that Takahasi teaches or suggests each and every feature of independent claims 4 and 26 except for features of “the light emitting diodes are disposed in order of white, red, green and blue” and “LED housing as well as each LED has a portion disposed inside the housing and a portion disposed outside the housing.” The Office Action relies upon Weindorf and Cohen to teach such features. In contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claims 4 and 26, Takahasi merely discloses that LEDs are entirely accommodated in a cup-shaped window 105. (see col 5, lines 16-23 and FIG.3 of Takahasi). Takahasi fails to teach or suggest the above-noted feature of claims 4 and 26. Moreover, as discussed above, Weindorf and Cohen fail to teach or suggest the feature of “a substrate parallel to the light-guiding plate.”

In addition, the Office Action does not rely upon Uratani to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takahasi, Weindorf and Cohen. Further, Uratani cannot remedy the deficiencies of Takahashi, Weindorf and Cohen. That is, Uratani also fails to teach or suggest the above-described feature of newly-amended independent claims 1, 4 and 26.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 4 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn because the applied references, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 4 and 26, as newly-amended. MPEP §2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Rovka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580(CCPA1974).” Further, the rejections of claims 2, 6-8, 28 and 29 should also be withdrawn at least because of their dependencies upon the respective independent claims 1, 4 and 26 and for the reasons as those set forth above.

With no other rejection pending, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 26, 28 and 29 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: August 22, 2007

By: 

Xiaobin You
Reg. No. L0112

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001